



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/693,157 | 10/20/2000 | Jang-Ho Cho | SAM-162 | 8192 |
| 7590 10/13/2004 | | | EXAMINER | |
| Steven M. Mills | | | GERSTL, SHANE F | |
| Samuels, Gauthier & Stevens, LLP 225 Franklin Street | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| Boston, MA 02110 | | | 2183 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 10/13/2004 | 1 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/693,157 | CHO, JANG-HO | | | | |
| Advisory Auton | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Shane F Gerstl | 2183 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 13 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2.⊠ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | |
| (a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceli | ng a corresponding number of fi | nally rejected claims. | | | | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | ion(s): | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | be allowable if submitted in a se | eparate, timely filed amendment | | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: | | dered but does NOT place the | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ause it is not directed SOLELY to | o issues which were newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | , , , | | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. \boxtimes The drawing correction filed on $9/13/04$ is a) \boxtimes application and applications are smaller than the second content of the se | proved or b) disapproved by | the Examiner. | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | • | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment to the independent claim 1 gives details on the accuracy history signal and its bit composition and how the signal is applied. None of these issues have been previously claimed and thus the scope of the claims have changed. A further search and more consideration would be required to adequately examine the claims.

EDDIE CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100